

**These minutes are a summary of the discussion. The audible recording is available at the following website: <http://bit.ly/T3S7CB>**

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting  
Minutes of April 2, 2014  
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall

**Present:** Chairman Jeremy Goldstein, Vice-Chair Holly P. Shriner, Kristy Carter (left meeting at 7:50 p.m.), Jim Edmonds (arrived in meeting at 5:04 p.m.), Karl Koon, Jane Gianvito Mathews and Joe Minicozzi

**Absent:** None

**Pre-Meeting - 4:30 p.m.**

At the pre-meeting, City staff provided the Commission with an update on the Form Based Code process, the retirement of the Planning Director, and an upcoming AICP Ethics Webinar available to the Commission to attend. Staff then announced that two items were requesting deferral to a later meeting. There was also discussion of the parameters for the Level II process.

**Regular Meeting - 5:00 p.m.**

Chairman Goldstein called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and informed the audience of the public hearing process.

Chairman Goldstein noted that overhead projector is not working, but that staff and the Commissioners will try to keep the public involved using hand-held pictures/maps/etc.

**Administrative**

- Mr. Koon moved to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2014, meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Shriner and carried unanimously by a 6-0 vote (Mr. Edmonds was not present at this time)
- Chairman Goldstein noted that the following subdivision appeal application has been withdrawn - An appeal of a minor subdivision recorded in Plat Book 134, Page 171 of the Buncombe County Register of Deeds identified as PIN #9648.71.4686 located at 93 Caledonia Road and PIN # 9648.71.4425 located at 129 Caledonia Road in the Buncombe County Tax Records. Appellant is the Kenilworth Residents Association, Inc. and the property owner is Caledonia, LLC.
- Mr. Minicozzi moved to continue the review of the conditional zoning request for the construction of 260 unit multi-family residential development on 12.75 acres at 40 Gerber Road with a request for modification of the requirements concerning the location of street trees to September 3, 2014. This motion was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried unanimously on a 7-0 vote. Ms. Shriner asked that when this matter comes back to the Commission that the number of units be clarified and be consistent in the staff report.
- At the developer's request, Ms. Mathews moved to continue the review of Subdivision Modification application on Mountain Song Lane for the allowance of substandard access provisions utilizing an existing unopened right-of-way to serve two lots until May 7, 2014. This motion was seconded by Mr. Minicozzi and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

**Agenda Items**

- (1) **Level II site plan review for the construction of 22 single-family residential townhomes and associated infrastructure on 4.54 acres on Thornes Lane. The project is known as**

**Dillingham Woods. PIN 9658-58-4045. The property is owned by Hill Ventures, LLC and the contact is Mike Hayes. Planner coordinating review – Julie Fields.**

At the request of Ms. Mathews, Ms. Shriner moved to recuse Ms. Mathews from participating in this matter due to a conflict of interest. This motion was seconded by Mr. Minicozzi and carried unanimously on a 7-0 vote.

Urban Planner Julia Fields oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of site plans for a 22-unit townhome development. This project is considered a Level II review pursuant to Section 7-5-9 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) which designates this process for residential developments containing 20 to 50 units.

The project site consists of a 4.54 acre parcel located at 60 Dillingham Road. The site is zoned RM-6 (Residential Multi-Family Low Density Residential) with similar zoning surrounding the parcel on which the development is proposed. In 2007, a Level II project consisting of 27 townhomes was approved for this site. A significant amount of infrastructure for the residential development was installed but never approved/accepted and the project was never completed.

The applicant is proposing to construct 22 townhomes on the property, all to be three bedroom dwelling units. A preliminary plat accompanies the site plan showing how the property lines for the individual homes will eventually be drawn.

Townhouses are a use by right subject to special requirements in the RM-6 District. The minimum lot size, width and side yards (except for street sides of corner lots and end units in townhouse clusters) are waived for townhome developments provided that the residential density does not exceed the maximum permissible residential density for the applicable district. The allowable density on the site would be 28 units.

The proposed lot sizes range from 3,331 square feet to 4,538 square feet. The dwelling units have footprints ranging from 1,378 square feet and gross floor areas ranging from 1,779 to 1,808 square feet. The maximum building height proposed is 31 feet.

Access to six of the dwelling units is proposed via individual driveways off of Dillingham Road. The remaining 16 units have access drives off of a proposed private road, Thornes Lane.

Each dwelling unit is designed with a two-car garage.

Compliance is required for street trees, building impact landscaping and tree save area and is shown on the submitted drawings. Open space of 15% of the site area is required and showing.

In the RM-6 District, height is limited to a maximum of 40 feet. The maximum building height proposed is 31 feet.

This project was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee at their meeting on March 3, 2014. Several property owners have expressed concern with traffic, stormwater and erosion problems.

Staff recommends approval of the project subject to compliance with the conditions as included in the TRC staff report.

Mr. Jesse Gardner, engineer with Civil Design Concepts, explained that his client acquired the property at the end of 2012. They realized that the value of the Haw Creek community and felt the earlier proposed development was too aggressive. Since a lot of the infrastructure was already installed, they reduced the density from 27 to 22 units. With the elimination of the 5 units, they will give each unit some yard space. They have also added

stormwater detention and water quality measures for stormwater as part of this project. He said that they will minimize the earthworks and use the earthworks that have already been done on that site. He said that this will be a townhouse project and all the common property will fall into a homeowners association, who will be responsible for maintaining the roads, stormwater pond, common infrastructure, etc. Pending approval, they will address their grading and erosion control permits and hope to be breaking ground the middle of May or first of June. They felt this project will be a great asset to the community and asked for the Commission's support.

In response to Chairman Goldstein, Mr. Gardner said that there has been an approximately 15-20% reduction in pervious pavement from the previous project. They have also eliminated one of the interior roads and made the units bigger. In addition they are not building any two-bedroom units.

In response to Mr. Koon, Mr. Gardner said that they will be able to meet all of the Technical Review Committee requirements.

Chairman Goldstein asked why some of the homes will access off Dillingham Road and others will access off Thornes Lane. Mr. Gardner responded that the City's Traffic Engineer provided numbers that show Dillingham Road is a low volume road with a 500 car per day count. As an engineer, he felt there was plenty of site distance for the cars to move in and out of their driveways. The Technical Review Committee recommended a potential turn-around space in front of each driveway unit and they will review that recommendation.

When Mr. Minicozzi asked if they could move the units facing Dillingham Road approximately 30 feet back into the property to provide an area for the vehicles to turn around, Mr. Gardner felt it's less about their distance from the road, but more about having space with the two-car garages to turn their cars around.

In response to Mr. Minicozzi, Mr. Gardner said that the street trees on their property on Dillingham Road would have to be removed.

At 5:30 p.m., Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing, reminding the public that this is a Level II review and it is the Planning & Zoning Commission's responsibility to decide whether the project can meet the technical requirements determined by the Technical Review Committee, which is made up of the City's professional technical review staff. A copy of the Technical Review Committee's comments can be made available to the public by calling the Planning & Development Office.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the project, for various reasons, some being, but are not limited to: number of units on the property is too much for Dillingham Road to handle; property is mainly fill dirt on the back side and there should have been a retaining wall built by the previous developer; safety concern of people having to back out of their driveways onto Dillingham Lane especially with hill, and speeding; disappointment for the hemlock trees to be cut down; mud on the back of the property due to the steep slope will draw mosquitoes; no room for the fire truck to maneuver on Thornes Lane; too much existing traffic on Dillingham Road; the grade level of this property is 2-3 feet lower than Dillingham Road; property is being built only for profit by the developer and taxes for the City; Dillingham Road has no shoulders; against cutting trees on Dillingham Road to install a sidewalk; concern about maintenance of silt pond; Dillingham Road needs repair; concern that houses will be built on fill area and in jack hammer area; concern about site lighting; concern that the neighbors have not seen a picture of what the homes will look like; neighboring property has water runoff problems since the property was brought up to grade; traffic count on Dillingham Road of 500 cars is too low and road should be re-studied; separation between development and existing home is not enough; is there any landscape required between the development and existing homes; safety hazard (when black ice and snow on Dillingham Road) of not being able to stop in time when cars are backing out of their driveways; existing trees encroach on Dillingham Road, causing the width of Dillingham Road to

seem smaller than it is; and, the Tree Commission told the previous developer that they could not cut the hemlocks for driveway cuts and the sidewalk would have to be constructed on the developer's property on the other side of the trees:

Mr. Jason Diggs, Haw Creek resident whose family abuts the project  
Mr. Michael Morris, resident of Mayfair Glen  
Mr. Ken Calloway, abutting property owner to proposed development  
Ms. Mary June, resident of Hawthorne Villages  
Mr. James Collier, abutting property owner to proposed development  
Mr. Dennis Wilson, resident of Mayfair Glen

At 5:54 p.m., Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fields responded to various questions raised by the public as follows: (1) the Fire Marshal did approve the fire turnaround; (2) the developer will construct sidewalks across their property only on Dillingham Road, but they cannot require a sidewalk on Thornes Lane; (3) she provided the neighborhood with copies of what the homes would look like; (4) side setback between the development and existing home is 6 feet and if the previous owner of the development said the separation would be more, it was a voluntary decision; (5) there are trees proposed between the development and existing homes; and (6) regarding the trees not being removed pursuant to the Tree Commission, she said that both the City's arborist and a representative from the Tree Commission were both at the Technical Review Committee and tree removal was not raised as an issue.

Mr. Gardner also responded to questions raised by the public. He said that homes, shopping centers, etc. can be built on fill. He cannot speak about issues from the previous owner, but he is familiar with the City's permitting process and they will comply with all City standards. Regarding maintenance of the silt pond, once the developer breaks ground and gets a grading permit the contractor is the responsible party. The silt pond will be converted into a stormwater bio-retention pond/rain garden (BMP) which will eventually be maintained by the homeowners association. Regarding the hemlock trees on their property, it does not look like they have been treated.

Development Services Director Shannon Tuch also responded to questions raised by the public. She said that when the fill was brought in, a grading permit would have been required and at that time the City would have verified that it was suitable fill material and compacted appropriately. In addition, the site would have been inspected during the fill process. She agreed that projects all the time are built on fill. She also noted that the BMP requires an annual inspection by the City and that City staff will also visit BMP's to make sure they are operating appropriately. Regarding water in the basement of an adjoining property owner, she felt that sometimes when projects start and then stop, because they alter the terrain and the project is not fully developed according to the plan approved, sometimes that will change the distribution of water. Often times follow-through of the project will oftentimes resolve water issues, and if not, that can be looked at more closely at a later date.

In response to Mr. Edmonds, Ms. Fields said that regarding cars backing onto Dillingham Road, from a safety standpoint it would be better for cars to just pull out; however, there is no standard making that a requirement.

When Vice-Chair Shriner noted she was not comfortable with cars backing onto Dillingham Road and suggested putting the two-car garages into the back of the houses, Mr. Gardner noted that there were elevation problems but that they did look into that option.

Interim Transportation Director and City Traffic Engineer Jeff Moore said that the City performed a count on Dillingham Road (for an unrelated matter) on January 14, 2014. The results were 530 cars per day. A traffic impact study was not required for this project. To trigger

a traffic impact study, we would need 100 vehicles in the peak hour (7-9 a.m. or 4-6 p.m.) and the numbers for this development should have 172 vehicles in a 24-hour period (15 in the morning peak hour and 17 in the peak hour in the afternoon). From our standpoint, because the project didn't trigger a traffic impact study, there is no indication of poor site distance that wouldn't meet the requirements.

Mr. Moore agreed with the recommendation that driveway access should be designed so that vehicles do not have to back out onto Dillingham Road; however, there is no standard making that a requirement. He noted that if the hemlock trees are removed and the trees that go back between the road and the sidewalk in the buffer area are low bushes, there should be more site distance than there is now.

In response to Mr. Minicozzi, Mr. Moore said that the curvature of Dillingham Road would be taken into account if a site distance study were conducted. The plans he received didn't show grade or elevations on Dillingham Road, and after a site visit, he didn't see anything that would cause him to trigger a site distance study. However, if there are concerns, a site distance study for the six driveways can be asked for by the Commission and prepared by the engineer. Mr. Moore said that last year the City lowered the speed limit to 25 mph, but they could ask for some type of "limited site distance" signage, or that mirrors be installed, etc. Ms. Tuch noted that regardless of the outcome of the site distance study, there is no standard, for single-family homes, to trigger a change to the design.

Ms. Carter acknowledged the concern of backing out onto Dillingham Road, but now there is not a standard that requires vehicles to pull out onto road. She also heard the other concerns, but agreed that many of them may not have occurred had the project actually been developed. Hopefully the new development will mitigate some of the problems.

In response to Vice-Chair Shriner, Mr. Gardner said that they are looking at providing a little bulb-out in the driveways because if no one wants to buy a unit because they have to back out onto Dillingham Road, it would be to their benefit to look for options.

When Vice-Chair Shriner suggested Mr. Gardner meet with Mr. Calloway to address his water concerns, Mr. Gardner agreed that he would be happy to meet with him.

Finding that the request is reasonable and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, and based on information provided in the staff report and as stated in the staff recommendation, Mr. Koon moved to recommend approval of the Level II site plan for the construction of 22 single-family residential townhomes and associated infrastructure on 4.54 acres on Thrones Lane, known as Dillingham Woods, subject to the conditions in the Technical Review Committee staff report. This motion was seconded by Chairman Goldstein and carried unanimously on a 6-0 vote (with Ms. Mathews being recused).

At 6:34 p.m., Chairman Goldstein announced a 5-minute recess.

- (2) Review of a Major Subdivision with a Subdivision Modification on Bridle Path Road for the creation of 7 lots served by a substandard access. The subject property is a total of 4.54 acres at 3 Bridle Path Road and includes PINs 9740-10-8566 and 9740-10-7741. Planner coordinating review – Jessica Bernstein.**

Urban Planner Jessica Bernstein oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of a major subdivision including a subdivision standard found in the Steep Slope Ordinance (Section 7-12-4 of the UDO) pertaining to road and right-of-way widths in order to access and create new parcels of land.

The project involves two parcels of land owned by Thomas Rackley, located off of Bridle Path Road with frontage on Lookout Road in North Asheville. The parcels are zoned RS-4, as

are surrounding lots, which are either undeveloped or contain single-family homes. The project site consists of approximately 3.93 acres and is within both zone A and a small portion of zone B of the steep slope designation.

The applicant is proposing to extend Bridle Path Road (an existing private drive) approximately 180 feet, terminating in a hammerhead turnaround. There are 7 lots proposed, five with frontage on the extended Bridle Path Road and two fronting on Lookout Road. The development of the homes is not a part of this application. Those would be individual single-family permits that would come at a later date as the lots were purchased.

The elevation on the project site varies from approximately 2205 feet at the southernmost corner at Lookout Road up to 2370 feet at the northern boundary, with an average slope of between 25 - 29%. While typical lots in the RS-4 zoning district are required to have a minimum of 10,000 square feet, due to the steep slope designation, the density is restricted to a minimum of 2.3 units per acre. This results in the seven lots shown on plan, with lot areas varying from 13,179 square feet up to 1.34 acres. There are additional requirements for building height found in the code.

There are no requirements for sidewalks or open space; however street trees will be required along the new section of road.

City standards in steep slope areas require 32 feet of right-of-way and 20 feet of pavement to serve the five lots off of Bridle Path Road, which is provided on the new section. The applicant is requesting a modification to maintain the current conditions along the existing stretch of road which leads to the new portion, based on right-of-way and topographic constraints inhibiting the ability to widen to City standards. The right-of-way on the existing portion of road is variable (from 26.5 feet up to 52.6 feet) and the pavement width is approximately 13 feet at the most narrow point. While this narrow width is similar to other streets in the immediate vicinity, it does not meet the City's standards. The applicant has indicated that they will likely be able to add approximately 12 to 18 inches to the roadway to increase the pavement width.

This project was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee at their meeting on March 17, 2014. Comments she has received included increased traffic, slope stability, erosion control and runoff during construction, and the existing runoff problems. In addition, neighbors in the area asked for a pedestrian connection off of the hammer-head to Lookout Road. She said there is no proof that this is a City right-of-way (shown on the plans as a utility easement) and therefore, it would be up to the neighbors and developer to agree to that connection.

Staff is supportive of this modification request to allow substandard access, using the existing variable right-of-way and pavement width, because it mirrors existing roadway conditions in the area and because the new lots all have frontage on the new portion of roadway which complies with City's standards. Representatives from Planning, Development Services, Transportation and Fire met on site with the applicant's agent to evaluate the conditions and come to this recommendation.

Mr. Jesse Gardner, engineer with Civil Design Concepts, said that regarding the pedestrian connection to Lookout Road, the utility easement is not entirely on their property;; however, what distance is on their property they would allow the pedestrian crossing.

At 6:54 p.m., Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing, stating that this is a subdivision approval and subdividing doesn't guarantee that the land is buildable.

The following individuals spoke against the major subdivision for several reasons, some being, but are not limited to: concerns that developer is asking abutting property owners for sewer easements but that they will not be granted due to various health and safety concerns (in addition

to a "do not disturb" easement on one property); full development of 7 lots will result in a number of negative impacts to neighborhood, including removal of numerous trees and other native vegetation, ongoing stormwater runoff and erosion, major roadwork, increased traffic on a quiet dead end street, obstruction of views, and stress on limited existing infrastructure); stormwater runoff onto Lookout Road; question regarding the buildability of lots that have a stream in them due to the 30-foot of undisturbed buffer required along the stream; question of whether a geological work has been done where they want the lots created; Bridle Path Road cannot handle additional traffic; no assurances that the sewer system can support 7 new homes; and concern that emergency vehicles will have trouble accessing the 7 new homes:

Mr. Dave Barry, resident on Stillwell Street  
Letter submitted by Barry and Elissa Lewis, residents on Stillwell Street  
Mr. Michael Sitzler, adjoining property owner  
Ms. Darlyne Sahara, area resident  
Mr. Greg Pittman, resident on Bridle Path Road  
Ms. Deidre Clarke, resident on Stillwell Street  
Ms. Susan Pittman, resident on Bridle Path Road

Mr. Jay Lurey, real estate broker representing Lisa Gould, asked if there is an agreement that shows that that Bridle Path Road (that comes off of Stillwell Street) is a private road. He questioned who has access to it because they would like to tap onto that road. Associate City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that Bridle Path Road is not a public road.

Development Services Director Shannon Tuch said that this project, as proposed, either promotes access, provides access or takes away access.

At 7:17 p.m., Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing.

Ms. Bernstein responded to various questions/comments from the public. She said that 7 units are permitted under the current zoning. She said that the applicant is required to submit for an allocation request for water and sewer prior to submitting the application. Both of those departments have indicated that this project can be done. The applicant is working with the Water Department to provide a waterline extension. Sewer line extensions will be required for the construction of the houses; they are not required for the subdivision of the land. If they are not able to obtain the easements, then the sewer line could not be extended and the house could not be constructed. The applicant has indicated that they can meet the City's requirements. There is concern about runoff in the area. The grading and erosion control permits are a separate review and in the Technical Review Committee's preliminary discussions, they mentioned all the requirements that would be put in place for the construction process, which is monitored very closely.

In response to Ms. Mathews question regarding the stream, Ms. Tuch said that assuming the stream is a stream of record, there would be the 30-foot buffer requirement. That would impact the buildable area, but whether you could build on it would be evaluated at a later date. They could ask for a combination of lots.

Ms. Tuch said that in learning about the concern of existing water runoff of the site to Lookout Road, she has contacted the Stormwater Services Manager and said that he was unaware of the runoff, but would send a crew to investigate the concern.

Chairman Goldstein clarified that the Planning & Zoning Commission is only considering a major subdivision with a modification concerning the width of the pavement on Bridle Path Road. As to the other concerns, those will be handled in a separate development review process which will require permits.

Ms. Carter noted a conflict in the Technical Review Committee report regarding the Emergency Address comment and the Fire Department comment. Interim Transportation Director and City Traffic Engineer Jeff Moore said that the person from the GIS Department is not necessarily the person who should be commenting on Emergency Access. That was his observation only. Ms. Carter pointed out that part of the Commission's review is that they trust the professionals on the Technical Review Committee.

Regarding slope stability, Mr. Minicozzi checked the stability index map and there are slope stability spots mostly further up the street on adjacent properties.

Finding that the request is reasonable and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, and based on information provided in the staff report and as stated in the staff recommendation, Mr. Koon moved to recommend approval of the major subdivision with a subdivision modification concerning the width of the pavement and right-of-way at Bridle Path Road (existing portion), and subject to the conditions listed in the Technical Review Committee staff report (suggesting that the engineer work with the neighbors for clarification of the project). This motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Shriner and carried unanimously on a 7-0 vote.

**(5) Consideration of a wording amendment to Section 7-11-3(b) of the City's Unified Development Ordinance concerning the applicability of landscape standards. Planner coordinating review – Julie Fields.**

Urban Planner Julia Fields said that this is the consideration of an ordinance amending Section 7-11-3(b)(1) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Asheville proposed in the interest of removing unnecessarily restrictive and potentially expensive regulatory requirements in industrial zoned districts (Commercial Industrial (CI) and Industrial (I)) by eliminating landscaping requirements where small additions to existing facilities are planned.

Section 7-11-3(b) establishes the instances in which landscape standards are applied when development is proposed in the City of Asheville. The section outlines which developments require full compliance with landscaping regulations and addresses those developments that are subject to lesser levels of compliance. Specifically, Section 7-11-3(b)(1)b. provides that:

*Building expansions or additions that are less than 50 percent of the pre-expansion floor area must meet the landscaping requirements only in the area around the addition which is parallel to any edge of the expansion area and extending to the property line or street pavement edge.*

This latter provision has worked well in most applications both in gaining some landscape compliance as additions are proposed but also in terms of finding an equitable and economically viable way of applying landscape standards to smaller additions.

There have been some situations, however, with properties zoned Commercial Industrial (CI) and Industrial (I) where this provision has resulted in substantial landscaping being required, with substantial expenditure, resulting from a very small planned expansion. As an example in one recent instance an approximately 3% expansion to a very large industrial operation would require that the entire parking field for the operation be redesigned to meet the parking lot landscape standards.

In order to avoid extensive landscape requirements being applied to small additions on industrially zoned properties, staff is proposing that the following language be added as a new subsection 7-11-3(b)(1)c of the Unified Development Ordinance:

*Building expansions or additions occurring on properties zoned Commercial Industrial or Industrial that result in an expansion of less than 5 percent of the pre-expansion floor area or 3,000 square feet in size whichever is less, are not required to meet additional*



*landscape standards. Cumulative expansions occurring over a three year period that exceed this threshold shall have to meet all applicable landscape standards.*

While this proposal addresses industrial properties only, staff will continue to research the regulations as they affect development in other zoning districts and may determine that additional modifications should be considered.

This proposal does not directly relate to the goals outlined in the Strategic Operating Plan but is most closely aligned with the goal for "economic growth and financial sustainability" in promoting an environment conducive to the expansion of existing businesses.

Pro:

- Eliminates excessive landscape requirements/expenditure for small industrial expansions.

Con:

- Some may feel this application unfairly addresses only industrially zoned properties.

City staff recommends approval of this wording amendment.

When Ms. Carter asked where City staff came up with the "less than 5% of the pre-expansion floor area or 3,000 square feet in size whichever is less", Ms. Fields said that staff looked at real life examples of similar properties.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 7:38 p.m. and when no one spoke, he then closed it at 7:38 p.m.

Finding that the request is reasonable and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, and based on information provided in the staff report and as stated in the staff recommendation, Mr. Minicozzi moved to recommend approval of the wording amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance concerning the applicability of landscape standards. This motion was seconded by Chairman Goldstein and carried unanimously on a 7-0 vote.

#### **(6) Discussion Item - AICP Updates and Training**

Planning & Development Director Judy Daniel said that the Commission is invited to an upcoming Webinar on Ethics Training.

#### **(7) Discussion Item - Historic Preservation Plan Update**

Director of Historic Resources Stacy Merten said that the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) of Asheville and Buncombe County has embarked on a planning process to develop a historic preservation master plan for the Asheville Buncombe region. Although the HRC currently has a successful preservation program that has been in place since 1979, the Commission wanted to further historic preservation efforts as supported through the City's adopted comprehensive and downtown master plans, and ensure that historic preservation remains integral to the strategic planning vision of Asheville and Buncombe County.

The HRC was awarded a Certified Local Government Grant through the State Historic Preservation Office and was able to match the grant with private donations and proceeds from the reprint of Cabins and Castles. The HRC has hired Heritage Strategies, LLC to prepare the plan and has formed an advisory committee to guide the planning process. The Preservation Society of Asheville and Buncombe County co-sponsored a kick-off event at the Basilica of St. Lawrence in downtown Asheville in November 2013, which was widely attended. The advisory committee has continued to work with Heritage Strategies over the last few months, gathering community input through a series of public meetings, focus groups and individual interviews that

will be synthesized into a draft plan for further community review. It is anticipated that a final draft of the plan will be presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission at the July meeting, before moving forward to City Council and eventually on to Buncombe County.

The Historic Preservation Master Plan will outline a vision, strategies and actions describing how the community's distinctive character and historic assets can play a role in planning for our future. It will highlight issues the community is facing regarding the viability of historic buildings and landscapes and seek to embed a preservation ethic within the wide range of community interests and activities as outlined in the comprehensive plan and downtown master plan. The plan will also seek to identify strategies for enhancing historic commercial areas and neighborhoods using heritage, the arts, cultural resources and community character to strengthen the local economy and enhance the quality of life for all area residents.

Ms. Merten responded to questions/comments raised by the Commission.

**(8) Discussion Item - Tiger II Update**

At 7:50 p.m. Ms. Carter left the meeting as she has previously heard the Tiger II update.

Community Development Director Jeff Staudinger said that this update is for TIGER II grant funded deliverables, including Neighborhood Greenways, Riverside Drive Development Plan and Transportation network Plan

The City of Asheville was awarded a U.S. Department of Transportation TIGER II Planning Grant in October of 2010, one of 33 communities receiving these funds. The grant has supported the East of the Riverway Sustainable Communities initiative. The activities funded directly with TIGER II funds are now being completed.

Three major deliverables comprise that work. These are:

- The development of final design and construction documents for the Town Branch and Clingman Forest Greenways, and the "Five Points Roundabout" located at the intersection of Clingman Avenue Extension and Depot Street;
- The Riverside Drive Development Plan, to develop options for the redevelopment of ten acres of City owned property , located on Riverside Drive in the heart of the River Arts District;
- The East of the Riverway Connections Plan, to Identify and prioritize specific transportation improvements and policies to support connection, needs, and future developments in the East of the Riverway area

He presented a summary of the results of these planning activities, as well as information about next steps.

**Other Business**

Chairman Goldstein announced (1) the April 24, 2014, worksession on the Form Based Code at 4:00 p.m. in Room 623 of City Hall; and (2) the next meeting on May 7, 2014, at 5:00 p.m. in the First Floor Conference Room in the City Hall Building. Planning & Development Director Judy Daniel said that she would check on the possible rescheduling of the July 2, 2014, meeting.

**Adjournment**

At 8:10 p.m., Mr. Minicozzi moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Shriner and carried unanimously on a 6-0 vote.